UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,951	01/17/2002	John R. Hind	RSW920010122US1	1746

7590 08/17/2006

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
BETIT, JACOB F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,951	HIND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Betit	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *3-23,25-27,30-50,52-54,56,57,59-78,80-84 and 88* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *3-23,25-27,30-50,52-54,56,57,59-78,80-84 and 88* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 14 June 2006 claims 3-4, 7, 10, 20, 22, 26, 27, 30-31, 34, 37, 47, 49, 53-54, 56-57, 59, 62, 75, 77, 81-84, and 91-93 are amended and claims 1-2, 24, 28-29, 51, 55, 58, 79, 85-87 are cancelled. Claims 3-23, 25-27, 30-50, 52-54, 56-57, 59-78, 80-84, and 88-93 are presently pending in the application.

2. The indicated allowability of claims 25, 52, 80, and 88-90 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow. The finality of the last office action has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1).

As to claim 88, Dedrick teaches a method of managing meta data using a central repository at a central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by a computing device through a communications network, the method comprising the steps of:

connecting to the central repository through the communications network based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29);

utilizing, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22); and

uploading any new segment from the computing device to the central repository at a predetermined time (see column 20, lines 26-29)

wherein the uploading step comprises: encrypting the new segment using an encryption key (see column 20, lines 22-29);.

Dedrick does not distinctly disclose wherein the uploading step comprises:

(a) temporarily locking the local repository;

(b) transmitting the encrypted new segment from the computing device to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository; and

(c) unlocking the local repository.

Mosher, Jr. et al. teaches (a), see paragraph 0010; (b), see paragraph 0014; and (c), see paragraph 0017-0019. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Mosher, Jr. et al. because these teachings would prevent further updates until notification that current records are safely stored to the backup system.

As to claim 89, Dedrick teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable medium readable by at least one of a computing device and a central repository subsystem, for managing meta data using a central repository at the central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by the computing device through a communication network, the computer program product comprising:

computer executable code configured to connect, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

computer executable code configured to update a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29);

computer executable code configured to utilize, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22); and

computer executable code configured to upload any new segment from the computing device to the central repository at a predetermined time (see column 20, lines 26-29)

wherein the computer executable code configured to updated comprises: computer executable code configured to encrypt the new segment using an encryption key (see column 20, lines 22-29).

Dedrick does not distinctly disclose wherein the computer executable code configured to upload comprises:

(a) computer executable code configured to temporarily lock the local repository;

(b) computer executable code configured to transmit the encrypted new segment from the computing device to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository; and

(c) computer executable code configured to unlock the local repository.

Mosher, Jr. et al. teaches (a), see paragraph 0010; (b), see paragraph 0014; and (c), see paragraph 0017-0019. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Mosher, Jr. et al. because these teachings would prevent further updates until notification that current records are safely stored to the backup system.

As to claim 90, Dedrick teaches a system for managing meta data in a secure manner, the system comprising:

a central repository subsystem comprising a central repository for storing a plurality of segments associated with a user in a collection order (see column 9, lines 57-65); and

at least one computing device capable of communicating with the central repository subsystem through a communications network, the computing device comprising a local repository and being capable of connecting, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21), updating the local repository with at least one of the segments from the central repository to produce a meta data collection associated

with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29), and utilizing the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist tire user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

wherein the computing device further comprises:

a plurality of applications selectively executable on the computing device (see column 5, lines 52-67);

a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications (see column 6, line 35 through column 7, line 8);

a data repository module, provided as an add-in module to the security-service providing architecture, for utilizing the meta data collection to assist the user in using the computing device (see figure 8, step 306); and

an encryption/decryption module for encryption any new segment to be transmitted to the central repository subsystem (see column 6, line 35 through column 7, line 8); and

the encryption/decryption module encrypts the new segment using an encryption key (see column 20, lines 22-29).

Dedrick does not distinctly disclose wherein the computing device further comprises:

(a) wherein the data repository module temporarily locks the local repository and creates the new segment based on collected meta data,

(b) the data repository module transmits the encrypted new segment to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository and

(c) unlocks the local repository.

Mosher, Jr. et al. teaches (a), see paragraph 0010; (b), see paragraph 0014; and (c), see paragraph 0017-0019. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Mosher, Jr. et al. because these teachings would prevent further updates until notification that current records are safely stored to the backup system.

As to claims 3, 30, and 57, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:

incrementally uploading any new meta data generated during the current user session from the computing device to the central repository (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 4, 31, and 59, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the connecting step comprises:

receiving, by the central repository subsystem, authentication information from the user (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 10-15);

verifying validity of the authentication information (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 14-17); and

notifying the computing device that the user has proper authority to access the central repository if the authentication information is verified as valid (see column 20, lines 20-24).

As to claims 10, 37, and 65, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the retrieving step is performed using heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line

12); and the utilizing step further comprises applying the retrieved meta data in each of the different contexts (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claims 11, 38, and 66, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context comprises at least one of the following:

opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a computer file, or executing an application program (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 23).

As to claims 17, 44, and 72, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and the applying step comprises:

automatically filling in the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see Dedrick, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claims 20, 47, and 75, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing step comprises:

formulating search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device; and executing a search based on the search requirements using heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 21, 48, and 76, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the search requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 22, 49, and 77, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:

providing a graphical user interface (GUI) (or a meta data editor) for allowing the user to organize the meta data collection (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-31).

As to claim 56, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the computer device uploads any new segment to the central repository at a predetermined time (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claim 83, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the central repository and the local repository is implemented using a network-attached storage (see Dedrick, column 3, lines 7-49).

5. Claims 5-6, 25, 32-33, 52, 60-61, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448).

As to claims 5, 32, and 60, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the authentication information comprises user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem.

Nguyen teaches this, see column 16, lines 13-33. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include the teachings of Nguyen because these teachings would prevent the password from being transferred over the network and allow both the client and the server to authenticate each other (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-16).

As to claims 6, 33, and 61, Dedrick as modified teaches wherein the verifying stop comprises: determining a secret key represented as a hash of: the received user identification, concatenated with a hash of the received identifier, concatenated with the received pass phrase; and comparing the secret key with a stored key associated with the user (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-33).

As to claims 25, 52, and 80, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein, in the encrypting step, the encryption key is represented as a hash of identifying information associated with the new segment, concatenated with a pass phrase of the user.

Nguyen teaches this, see column 16, lines 13-49. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Nguyen because these teachings would prevent unauthorized access to the data using an encryption key that is difficult to predict.

Claims 7-9, 34-36, and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claims 7, 34, and 62, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the updating step comprises:

(a) determining if the local repository is at a null state;

(b) first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository, is not at a null state; and

(c) second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches (a), see column 7, lines 38-65; (b), see column 7, lines 52-65; and (c) see column 7, lines 44-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Kim because these teachings would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see Kim, column 7, lines 38-65).

As to claims 8, 35, and 63 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said first requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29); and

applying the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

As to claims 9, 36, and 64 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said second requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29); and

generating the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

Claims 12-16, 39-43, and 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Bull et al. (U.S patent No. 5,901,287).

As to claims 12 and 39 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing stop further comprises: continuously collecting meta data resulting from use of the computing device during the current user session at the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick as modified does not distinctly disclose the method further comprises:

(a) generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and

(b) processing the new segment.

Bull et al. teaches (a) and (b), see column 4, lines 38-32. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Bull et al. because these teachings would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33)

As to claims 13 and 40, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the processing step comprises:

updating the meta data collection with the new segment (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claims 14 and 41, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data comprises application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the utilizing step further comprises:

determining statistical information associated with the meta data, the statistical information indicating relationships between the meta data, wherein the retrieving step is performed in part based on the statistical information (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12).

As to claims 15 and 42, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claims 16 and 43, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the application data comprise at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claim 67, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claim 68, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 69, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 14 above.

As to claim 70, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 15 above.

As to claim 71, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 16 above.

Claims 18, 45, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application

publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Mohan et al. U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claims 18 and 45, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further comprises:

(a) retrieving, from the pieta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and

(b) presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

Mohan et al. teaches (a) and (b), see column 11, lines 7-13. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Mohan et al. because these teachings would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or to fill in items that are not in the normal user profile without having to delete or fill in items every time a particular form is filled out. (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6)

As to claim 73, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 18 above.

Claims 19, 46, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claims 19, 46, and 74, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data comprises a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step comprises: presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches this (see paragraph 0050). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Chun et al. because these teachings would give the user the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., paragraph 0050).

Claims 23, 50, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,636,246 B1).

As to claims 23, 50, and 78, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches this, see column 5, lines 18-33. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Nagahara et al. because these teachings would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see Nagahara et al., abstract).

Claims 26, 53, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" (herein referred to as Net Security article).

As to claims 26 and 53, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed -by a CDSA add-on module.

Net Security article teaches this, see page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Net Security article because these teachings would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into multiple applications (see Net Security article, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 81, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 26 above.

Claims 27, 54, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1).

As to claims 27 and 54, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols.

Charisius et al. teaches this, see paragraph 0010. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Charisius et al. because these teachings would allow multiple users to view the same workflow and project plans, provide persistent storage, monitor the progress of activated project plan, and simultaneously create plans from the same workflow (see Charisius et al., paragraph 0010).

Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,843 B1).

As to claim 84, Dedrick does not distinctly disclose wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means.

Lim teaches this, see column 8, lines 46-58. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include the teachings of Lim because these teachings would grant access to the remote servers through a common API (see Lim, column 7, lines 34-44).

Claims 91-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mosher, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-90 above, and further in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1).

As to claims 91- 93, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data collection stared in the local repository of the computing device at the user's side (see Dedrick, figure 2, reference number 27)

Dedrick does not distinctly disclose the meta data collection includes a plurality of meta data groups, each of the meta data groups corresponding to one of a plurality of roles of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this, see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Arlein et al. because these teachings would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of the users (see Arlein et al., paragraph 0009).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

jfb
8 Aug 2006

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER